

Drawing Amendments

In Figure 2B, Applicant has amended reference numeral "80" to read "88". The specific changes are marked in red on the enclosed marked-up copy of the amended drawings.

The specific changes are marked in red on the enclosed marked-up copy of the amended drawings attached hereto.

Substance of Interview

Applicant's attorney thanks Examiner Tran for her courtesy and helpfulness during a telephonic interview on July 27, 2005. During the interview, Applicant's attorney explained the structural differences between the cited reference (WO 97/43528) and Applicant's structure as defined by proposed claimed revisions forwarded to the Examiner on July 7, 2005. In particular, Applicant's attorney explained how the proposed claims recite the specific baffle assemblies extending longitudinally through the first and chambers and accordingly provide direct fluid communication through the reactor bed between the first and second chambers to provide sequential passes through the reactor bed directly between the first and second chambers. The Examiner acknowledged the differences but deferred any comment as to patentability pending an update of her search.

In the Examiner's June 21, 2005 report, the Examiner objected to the drawings because in Figure 2B (filed on 1/3/05), "80" should be changed to "88". Figure 2B has been amended accordingly.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because on page 6 after line 8 in the previously inserted paragraph, at line 6 "18" should be changed to "16" and on page 7 after line 3 in the inserted paragraph, at line 5 "16" should be changed to "18". Appropriate correction has been made.

The Examiner objected to claim 4 because in line 3, "extends" should be changed to "extend". Appropriate correction has been made in the amended claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 13 as being unclear as to how the sections are related to the parts respectively introduced in claims 6 and 12. The claims have been amended to specify that the catalyst bearing parts correspond to the sections.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by or obvious in view of WO 97/43528. With respect, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization that the cited reference has a first baffle assembly in a first chamber extending "between" the housing and the catalyst bed.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicant's structure is a housing longitudinally partitioned by a reactor bed to provide a first chamber defined between the reactor bed and the housing at one end and a second chamber defined between the housing and the reactor bed at the other end. The chambers are further subdivided longitudinally by baffles extending longitudinally through the chambers between the housing and the respective faces of the catalyst bed. Fluid communication between the first housing and the second housing is direct and the housing in conjunction with the baffles causes redirection of the fluid flow from one zone of the reactor bed to another zone.

In contrast, the structure of the cited reference has at least four chambers (referring to Figure 10) with transverse rather than longitudinally extending baffles. Furthermore fluid communication between a first chamber and a last chamber requires passage from the first chamber through the reactor bed to a chamber 38 back through the reactor bed to an unlabelled chamber and through a pipe into the last chamber. Each pass is radially inwardly and the "first baffle" extends across a first face of the reactor bed rather than between the reactor bed and the housing.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that its design as claimed in amended claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by WO 97/43528.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-13 as being obvious in view of WO 97/43528 in view of FR 2226865. Applicant notes that the latter reference was cited simply to show a muffler in which at least one of the inlet and outlet passages extends through a side or ends of the housing. As this doesn't reflect on the different flow arrangement and baffle arrangement discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13 in the amended claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited combination.

The Examiner rejected claims 14-15/1 as being obvious in view of WO 97/43528 in view of Harris (4601168) and White et al (5578227).

Applicant notes that Harris was cited simply with respect to a housing having cup-shaped first and second parts joined at respective edges to a sleeve and that White was cited to show a housing comprising cup-shaped first and second parts joined at

respective outer edges. Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in the teaching of Harris or White which would cause one to modify WO 97/43528 to reconfigure its baffle and floor arrangement in the manner defined by claim 1 as amended. Accordingly claims 14-15/1 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

The Examiner further rejected claims 14-15/2 as being obvious in view of WO 97/42528 in view of FR 2226865 as applied to claim 2 and further in view of Harris (4601168) and White et al (5578277). As none of FR 2226865, Harris or White et al suggest the baffle and flow arrangement of claim 1 as amended, those references would not teach how WO 97/43528 could be reconfigured to yield the invention claimed in claim 1 as presently amended. Accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-15/2 are patentable over the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5-13/4 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 9-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6622482 in view of WO 97/43528 and FR 2226865.

The Examiner suggested claims 1-2, 9-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6622482 are substantially the same as that of the instant claims. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no basis for combining U.S. Patent No. 6622482 with WO 97/43528 as suggested by the Examiner. The references are contradictory. U.S. Patent No. 6622482 teaches at least three sequential unidirectional passes through a reactor bed with each pass being from one side of the reactor bed (the inlet side) to another side of the reactor bed (the outlet side).

This is contrary to WO 97/43528 which teaches passes in opposite directions with no passes directly between a first chamber and a second chamber wherein the first and second chambers are defined as in amended claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the double patenting objection in view of the claim 1 amendments and for the reasons set out above. For the same reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's double patenting objections to claims 2-3, (5-7, 12-13)/(2-3), (14-15)/1 and (14-15)/2 are also not obvious in view of the cited references as none of the references suggest a configuration as claimed in Applicant's amended

claim 1.

For all of the reasons set out above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and action toward that goal is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Milne
Registration No. 34,534
Telephone: 416-862-5790
Facsimile: 416-862-7661
Email: peter.milne@gowlings.com

PM:hcu

Enc.
TOR_LAW\ 6101392\1

1/6




FIG. 1




FIG. 2A




FIG. 2B

